arXiv:1702.07584v1 [math.FA] 24 Feb 2017

Dimensional transport inequalities and Brascamp-Lieb inequalities

Erik Thomas

February 27, 2017

Abstract

The goal of the present paper is to discuss new transport inequalities for convex measures. We retrieve some dimensional forms of Brascamp-Lieb inequalities. We also give some quantitative forms involving the Wasserstein's distances.

1 Introduction

We shall begin by recalling Borell's terminology [Bor1, Bor2] about convex measures. Although we will not use explicitly Borell's results, it allows to explain the values and internal relations between the parameters appearing in our study.

Let $\alpha \in [-\infty, +\infty]$. A Radon probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (or on an open convex set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$) is called α-concave, if it satisfies

$$\mu\left(tA + (1-t)B\right) \geq \left(t\mu\left(A\right)^{\alpha} + (1-t)\,\mu\left(B\right)^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \tag{1}$$

for all $t \in (0,1)$ and for all Borel sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. When $\alpha = 0$, the right-hand side of (1) is understood as $\mu\left(A\right)^{t}\mu\left(B\right)^{1-t}$: μ is a log-concave measure. When $\alpha = -\infty$, the right-hand side is understood as $\min\left\{\mu\left(A\right), \mu\left(B\right)\right\}$ and when $\alpha = +\infty$ as $\max\left\{\mu\left(A\right), \mu\left(B\right)\right\}$. We remark that the inequality (1) is getting stronger when α increases, so the case $\alpha = -\infty$ describes the largest class whose members are called convex or hyperbolic probability measures. In [Bor1, Bor2], Borell proved that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure is α-concave (and verifies (1)) if and only if $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and μ is supported on some open convex subset $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ where it has a nonnegative density p which satisfies, for all $t \in (0,1)$,

$$p\left(tx+(1-t)\,y\right)\geq\left(tp\left(x\right)^{\alpha_n}+(1-t)\,p\left(y\right)^{\alpha_n}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_n}},\qquad\forall x,y\in\Omega,\tag{2}$$

where $\alpha_n := \frac{\alpha}{1-n\alpha} \in \left[-\frac{1}{n},+\infty\right]$. Note that this amounts to the concavity of $\alpha_n p^{\alpha_n}$. In particular, μ is log-concave if and only if it has a log-concave density ($\alpha=\alpha_n=0$).

We shall focus on the densities rather than on the measures, so let us reverse the perspective. We are given $\kappa>-1$, or more precisely,

$$\kappa\in\left[-\frac{1}{n},+\infty\right]=\left[-\frac{1}{n},0\right[\cup\{0\}\cup\left]0,+\infty\right[,\tag{3}$$

and a probability density ρ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (by this we mean a nonnegative Borel function with $\int\rho=1$), with the property that $\kappa\rho^\kappa$ is concave on its support. Borell's result then tells us that the (probability) measure with density ρ is $\kappa(n) := \frac{\kappa}{1+n\kappa}$-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. This suggests two different behaviors depending on the sign of κ since $\rho^{\kappa(n)}$ is convex or concave. Let us describe them.

Case 1

This corresponds to $\kappa\in\left]0,+\infty\right]$ (that is, for measures, $0<\kappa(n)\leq\frac{1}{n}$). We set $\beta := \frac{1}{\kappa}\in[0,+\infty)$ and we work with densities of the form $\rho_\beta\left(x\right)=\frac{W(x)^\beta}{\int_\Omega W^\beta}$ where $W:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}_+$ is concave on its support. Note that the measure is supported on $\Omega=\{W>0\}\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, which is an open bounded convex set. The typical examples are the measures defined by

$$d\tau_{\sigma,\beta}\left(x\right)=\frac{1}{C_{\sigma,\beta}}\left(\sigma^2-\left|x\right|^2\right)_+^\beta dx,\qquad\beta>0,\sigma>0,$$

where $C_{\sigma,\beta}=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\sigma^2-\left|x\right|^2\right)_+^\beta dx=\sigma^{2\beta+n}\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}\frac{\Gamma(\beta+1)}{\Gamma\left(\beta+\frac{n}{2}+1\right)}$ is a normalizing constant.

Case 2

This corresponds to $\kappa\in\left[-\frac{1}{n},0\right[$ (that is, for measures, $\kappa(n)\leq 0$). We set $\beta := -\frac{1}{\kappa}=n-\frac{1}{\kappa(n)}\geq n$ and we work with densities of the form $\rho_\beta\left(x\right)=\frac{W(x)^{-\beta}}{\int_\Omega W^{-\beta}}$ where $W:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}_+\cup\{+\infty\}$ is a convex function. Note that the support of the measure is given by the convex set $\{W<+\infty\}$. The typical examples are the (generalized) Cauchy probability measures defined by

$$d\mu_\beta\left(x\right)=\frac{1}{C_\beta}\left(1+\left|x\right|^2\right)^{-\beta}dx,\qquad\beta>\frac{n}{2},$$

where $C_\beta=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(1+\left|x\right|^2\right)^{-\beta}dx=\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}\frac{\Gamma\left(\beta-\frac{n}{2}\right)}{\Gamma(\beta)}$ is a normalizing constant.

In the sequel, we shall adopt the following unified notation. Given κ as in (3), we consider a nonnegative function $W : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ with the convention that

$$\begin{cases} \text{when } \kappa > 0, & W \text{ is concave on the bounded open convex set } \{W > 0\} \\ \text{when } \kappa < 0, & W \text{ is convex on } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

with the property that

$$\int W^{1/\kappa} < +\infty;$$

we then define the density

$$\rho_{\kappa,W}(x) = \frac{1}{\int W^{1/\kappa}} W^{1/\kappa}(x). \tag{4}$$

Our first goal is to study generalized transport inequalities for these probability measures (which we identify with the density).

Let μ a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we recall that a transport inequality is an inequality of the form

$$\alpha\left(\mathcal{W}_c\left(\mu, \cdot\right)\right) \leq H\left(\cdot \| \mu\right),$$

where α is an increasing function on $[0, +\infty)$ with $\alpha\left(0\right) = 0$, $\mathcal{W}_c\left(\mu, \cdot\right)$ is the Kantorovich distance from μ and $H\left(\cdot \| \mu\right)$ a relative entropy with respect to μ. Let us recall that given a cost function $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$, the Kantorovich distance $\mathcal{W}_c\left(\mu, \nu\right)$ between two probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_c\left(\mu, \nu\right) = \inf_{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} c\left(x, y\right) d\pi\left(x, y\right)$$

where the infimum is taken over all probability measures π on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ projecting on μ and ν respectively. In case where $c\left(x, y\right) = |x - y|^p$, with $p \geq 1$, we note

$$\mathcal{W}_c\left(\mu, \nu\right) = W_p^p\left(\mu, \nu\right).$$

The relative entropy is defined as follows.

Definition 1 (Entropy)**.** *Let κ, W and $\rho_{\kappa,W}$ be given as in the paragraph before* (4)*. Given a probability density ρ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we introduce the (κ, W)-entropy*

$$H_{\kappa,W}(\rho) := \frac{1}{\kappa} \int \left(\rho^{1+\kappa} - \rho\right) + \frac{\kappa + 1}{-\kappa} \int \rho\, W$$

provided the integrands are integrable (we set $H_{\kappa,W}(\rho) = +\infty$ otherwise). The relative entropy is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\kappa,W}(\rho || \rho_{\kappa,W}) &:= H_{\kappa,W}(\rho) - H_{\kappa,W}(\rho_{\kappa,W}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa} \int \left(\rho^{\kappa+1} - (\kappa + 1)\, \rho\, W\right) + \int W^{1+1/\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

The reader can convince himself that the functional $\rho \to H_{\kappa,W}(\rho)$ is convex in ρ (note the role played by the sign of $\kappa > -1$) and that $H_{\kappa,W}(\rho||\rho_{\kappa,W}) \geq 0$. Let us emphasize that the log-concave case corresponds to the case $\kappa \to 0$. We can approximate it from above or from below. For instance, given a convex function V with $V \to +\infty$ at infinity, if we set, for $\kappa < 0$ close to zero with $W(x) = W_\kappa(x) = (1 - \kappa V(x))_+$ then, as $\kappa \to 0^-$,

$$\rho_{\kappa,W_\kappa} \to \rho_V := \frac{1}{\int e^{-V}} e^{-V}$$

and $H_{\kappa,W_\kappa}(\rho||\rho_{\kappa,W_\kappa}) \to \int \log\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_V}\right)\rho$, the classical relative entropy of ρ with respect to ρ_V.

Generalized transport inequalities have been studied in [CE-G-H] in order to study quasilinear parabolic-elliptic equations, under some uniform convexity assumption. The following result can be seen as a dimensional form of the transport inequality for log-concave measures stated in [CE] that goes back to earlier work by Bobkov and Ledoux. The cost is defined by

$$c_{\kappa,W}(x,y) = \frac{\kappa+1}{-\kappa}\Big[W(y) - W(x) - \nabla W(x)\cdot(y-x)\Big]. \tag{5}$$

According to the context recalled before (4), note that $c_{\kappa,W}(x,y) \geq 0$, with $c_{\kappa,W}(x,x) = 0$. This cost is actually mainly independent of κ, which is there only to distinguish between convex ($\kappa < 0$) and concave ($\kappa > 0$) situations. The general transport inequality is as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let κ, W and $\rho_{\kappa,W}$ be given as in the paragraph before* (4)*. Then we have the following transport inequality, for the entropy and cost defined above: for any probability density ρ on $\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$W_{c_{\kappa,W}}(\rho_{\kappa,W},\rho) \leq H_{\kappa,W}(\rho||\rho_{\kappa,W}) \tag{6}$$

According to the discussion above, when $W(x) = W_\kappa(x) = (1+\kappa V(x))_+$ and $\kappa \to 0^-$, the transport inequality recalled in [CE] for $\rho_V := e^{-V}$, namely

$$W_{c_V}(\rho_V,\rho) \leq H_V(\rho||\rho_V),$$

is recovered, for the cost $c_V(x,y) = V(y) - V(x) - \nabla V(y)\cdot(y-x)$ and the relative entropy $H_V(\rho||\rho_V) = \int \log\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_V}\right)\rho$.

The previous inequality is therefore not surprising, and it requires only a minor work to extract it from [CE-G-H].

Interestingly enough, we will show that the previous inequality allows to reproduce, by a linearization procedure, the dimensional Brascamp-Lieb inequalities

obtained by Bobkov and Ledoux [Bo-Le1] and Nguyen [Ng] thus providing a mass transport approach to them.

Our second goal is to obtain quantitative versions of the transport inequality above. Before announcing our results, we need some notation. Let the function $\mathcal{F}$ be defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\mathcal{F}(t) := t - \log(1+t), \qquad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The function $\mathcal{F}$ is an increasing, convex function on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and it behaves like t^2 when t is small and like t when t is large, more precisely:

$$\frac{1}{4}\min\left\{t, t^2\right\} \leq \mathcal{F}(t) \leq \min\left\{t, t^2\right\}, \qquad \forall t \geq 0.$$

We introduce next a (weighted) isoperimetric type constant. Given a probability measure μ, we denote by $h_W(\mu)$ the best nonnegative constant such that the following inequality

$$\int \mathcal{F}(|\nabla f|)\, W d\mu \geq \int \mathcal{F}\left(h_W(\mu)\left|f - m_f\right|\right) d\mu \tag{7}$$

holds for every smooth enough function $f \in L^1(\mu)$. One may hope that $h_W(\rho_{\kappa,W}) > 0$. We shall briefly discuss this in the last section.

It may be convenient to change the notation and focus rather on the parameter

$$\beta = \pm\frac{1}{\kappa}$$

according to the **Case 1** and **Case 2** detailed previously. With some abuse of notation, we will denote $\rho_{\beta,W}$, $H_{\beta,W}$ and $c_{\beta,W}$ the corresponding quantities.

So, more explicitly, in **Case 1**, which corresponds to $\kappa > 0$, we are given a $\beta \in [0, +\infty[$ and function $W : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ concave on its support such that

$$\rho_{\beta,W}(x) := \frac{W(x)^\beta}{\int W^\beta}$$

is a probability density. In this **Case 1** the cost is $c_{\beta,W}(x,y) = (\beta+1)\Big(W(x) - W(y) + \nabla W(x)\cdot(y-x)\Big)$ and the relative entropy $H_{\beta,W}(\rho\|\rho_{\beta,W}) := \int\Big(\beta\rho^{1+1/\beta} - (\beta+1)\,\rho W\Big) + \int W^{\beta+1}$.

Theorem 2. *Under the notation of* **Case 1** *recalled above, introduce the costs*

$$\widetilde{c}(x,y) = c\mathcal{F}\left(h_W(\rho_{\beta,W})\,|y-x|\right)$$

where $c > 0$ is some fixed numerical constant, and

$$c(x,y) = c_{\beta,W}(x,y) + \widetilde{c}(x,y).$$

Then, if ρ and $\rho_{\beta,W}$ have the same center of mass, we have

$$H_{\beta,W}(\rho||\rho_{\beta,W}) \geq \mathcal{W}_c\left(\rho_{\beta,W},\rho\right). \tag{8}$$

Remark 1. Since the inequality $\mathcal{W}_c\left(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}\right) = \mathcal{W}_{c_{\beta,W}+\widetilde{c}}\left(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}\right) \geq \mathcal{W}_{c_{\beta,W}}\left(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}\right) + \mathcal{W}_{\widetilde{c}}\left(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}\right)$ holds, the second transport inequality gives a remainder term for the first inequality:

$$H_{\beta,W}\left(\rho\|\rho_{\beta,W}\right) - \mathcal{W}_{c_{\beta,W}}\left(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}\right) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\widetilde{c}}(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}). \tag{9}$$

In **Case 2**, which corresponds to $\kappa \in \left[-\frac{1}{n},0\right[$, we are given a $\beta \geq n$ and function $W : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ convex such that

$$\rho_{\beta,W}(x) := \frac{W(x)^{-\beta}}{\int W^{-\beta}}$$

is a probability density. In this **Case 2** the cost is $c_{\beta,W}\left(x,y\right) = (\beta-1)\left(W\left(y\right) - W\left(x\right) - \nabla W\left(x\right)\cdot(y-x)\right)$ and the relative entropy $H_{\beta,W}(\rho\|\rho_{\beta,W}) := \int\left((\beta-1)\,\rho W - \beta\rho^{1-1/\beta}\right) + \int W^{1-\beta}$.

Theorem 3. *Under the notation of* **Case 2** *recalled above, introduce the costs*

$$\widetilde{c}\left(x,y\right) = \frac{c}{\beta}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)^2 \mathcal{F}\left(h_W(\rho_{\beta,W})\ |y-x|\right)$$

where $c>0$ is some fixed numerical constant, and

$$c\left(x,y\right) = c_{\beta,W}\left(x,y\right) + \widetilde{c}\left(x,y\right).$$

Then, if ρ and $\rho_{\beta,W}$ have the same center of mass, we have

$$H_{\beta,W}(\rho||\rho_{\beta,W}) \geq \mathcal{W}_c\left(\rho_{\beta,W},\rho\right). \tag{10}$$

Remark 2. As in the **Case 1**, this gives a remainder term for the first transport inequality:

$$H_\beta\left(\rho\right) - \mathcal{W}_{c_{\beta,W}}\left(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}\right) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\widetilde{c}}(\rho,\rho_{\beta,W}). \tag{11}$$

The idea of the proof is to transport the densities ρ onto the measure $\rho_{\beta,W}$. Cordero in [CE] uses optimal transportation to obtain a transport inequality for log-concave measures. We recall some backgrounds about mass transportation at the beginning of the following section but we refer to [V] for a detailed approach.

In a second section, we will use transport inequalities to retrieve some dimensional versions of Brascamp-Lieb inequalities. Such inequalities had already been

studied by Bobkov and Ledoux in [Bo-Le1] where they use a Prékopa-Leindler type inequality. More recently, Nguyen in [Ng] retrieve these inequalities with a L^2- Hörmander method. Our approach is different. From transport inequalities (Theorems 1 and 2), we will use a linearization procedure to retrieve these inequalities.

I would like to thank my Professor Dario Cordero-Erausquin for his encouragements, his careful reviews and his many useful discussions.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

In this part, we do not use the notation β because there it is useless to separate the proof between **Case 1** and **Case 2**. We can assume that $\int W^{1/\kappa} = 1$. The proof is based on optimal transportation. Let us recall briefly what it is about. Let two probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We say a map $T : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ transports the measure μ onto the measure ν if:

$$\nu(B) = \mu\left(T^{-1}(B)\right), \qquad \text{for all borelian sets } B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This gives a transport equation: for all nonnegative Borel function $b : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b(y)\, d\nu(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b(T(x))\, d\mu(x). \tag{12}$$

When μ and ν have densities with respect to Lebesgue measure (it will be always the case in this paper), say F and G, (12) becomes:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b(y)\, G(y)\, dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b(T(x))\, F(x)\, dx. \tag{13}$$

The existence of a such map T is resolved by the following Theorem of Brenier [Br] and refined by McCann [Mc1].

Theorem 4. *If μ and ν are two probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, then there exists a convex function φ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\nabla\varphi$ transports μ onto ν. Furthermore, $\nabla\varphi$ is uniquely determined μ almost-everywhere.*

As φ is convex on its domain, it is differentiable μ almost-everywhere. If we assume φ of class C^2, the change of variables $y = \nabla\varphi(x)$ in (13) shows that φ satisfies the Monge-Ampère equation, for μ almost-every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$F(x) = G(\nabla\varphi(x)) \det D^2\varphi(x). \tag{14}$$

Here $D^2\varphi(x)$ stands for the Hessian matrix of φ at the point x. Cafarelli's Theorems [Ca1] and [Ca2] asserts the validity of (14) in classical sense when the

functions F and G are Hölder-continuous and strictly positive on their respective supports. Generally speaking, the matrix $D^2\varphi(x)$ can be defined with the Taylor expansion of φ (μ almost-everywhere)

$$\varphi(x+h) =_{h\to 0} \varphi(x) + \nabla\varphi(x)\cdot h + \frac{1}{2}D^2\varphi(x)(h)\cdot h + o\left(|h|^2\right).$$

In our case we are given a probability density ρ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, which we can assume to be, by approximation, continuous and strictly positive. Let $T = \nabla\varphi$ the Brenier map between $\rho_{\kappa,W}$ and ρ. Because $\rho_{\kappa,W}$ has a convex support, and is continuous on its support, we know that $\varphi \in W^{2,1}_{\text{loc}}$. Then the following integration by parts formula

$$\int f\,\Delta\varphi = -\int \nabla\varphi\cdot\nabla f$$

is valid for any smooth enough function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. We begin by writing Monge-Ampère equation:

$$\rho_{\kappa,V}(x) = \rho(T(x))\det D^2\varphi. \tag{15}$$

It follows that for

$$\rho(T(x))^\kappa = \rho_{\kappa,W}(x)^\kappa\left(\det D^2\varphi\right)^{-\kappa} = W(x)\left(\det D^2\varphi\right)^{-\kappa} \tag{16}$$

Recall that for $\kappa \in [-\frac{1}{n}, +\infty]$, the functional

$$M \to \frac{1}{\kappa}\det{}^{-\kappa}(M)$$

is concave on the set of nonnegative symmetric $n\times n$ matrices. If we consider the tangent at the identity matrix I we find that

$$\frac{1}{\kappa}\det{}^{-\kappa}(M) \geq \frac{1}{\kappa} - \operatorname{tr}(M-I).$$

Actually, for future use, let us introduce

$$\mathcal{G}_\kappa(M) := \frac{1}{\kappa}\det{}^{-\kappa}(M) - \frac{1}{\kappa} + \operatorname{tr}(M-I) \geq 0. \tag{17}$$

So if we introduce the displacement function function $\theta(x) = \varphi(x) - |x|^2/2$ so that $T(x) = \nabla\varphi(x) = x + \nabla\theta(x)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\kappa}\rho(T(x))^\kappa \geq W(x)\left(\frac{1}{\kappa} - \Delta\theta(x)\right) + W(x)\mathcal{G}_\kappa(D^2\theta(x))$$

Integrating with respect to $\rho_{\kappa,W} = W^{1/\kappa}$ and performing an integration by parts (note that $W^{1+\frac{1}{\kappa}} \to 0$ at infinity) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\kappa}\int \rho^{1+\kappa} &\geq \frac{1}{\kappa}\int \rho_{\kappa,W}^{1+\kappa} - \int W^{1+\frac{1}{\kappa}}\Delta\theta + \int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa(D^2\theta(x))\rho_{\kappa,W} \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa}\int \rho_{\kappa,W}^{1+\kappa} + \frac{1+\kappa}{\kappa}\int W^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}\nabla W\cdot\nabla\theta + \int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa(D^2\theta(x))\rho_{\kappa,W}\end{aligned}$$

By definition of mass transport we have

$$\frac{1+\kappa}{\kappa}\int W(y)\,\rho(y)\,dy = \frac{1+\kappa}{\kappa}\int W(T(x))W^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}(x)\,dx$$

so adding the left-hand expression to the left and the right-hand expression to the right we find (adding also the required cosmetic constant) that

$$H_{\kappa,W}(\rho) = H_{\kappa,W}(\rho_{\kappa,W}) + \int c_{\kappa,W}(x,T(x))\,\rho_{\kappa,W} + \int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa(D^2\theta(x))\rho_{\kappa,W},$$

or equivalently

$$H_{\kappa,W}(\rho||\rho_{\kappa,W}) \geq \int c_{\kappa,W}(x,T(x))\,\rho_{\kappa,W} + \int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa(D^2\theta(x))\rho_{\kappa,W}. \tag{18}$$

In particular, since $\mathcal{G}_\kappa \geq 0$, we find, by the definition of the transportation cost, the inequality stated in Theorem 1.

3 Remainder terms (Theorems 2 and 3)

The main step is to obtain a quantitative form of the inequality (17) and the approach is not the same whether we are in **Case 1** or in **Case 2**. The rest of the proof is exactly the same.

3.1 Case 1

We start from (18) and try to exploit the last term in order to get an improved inequality. The following Lemma gives a quantitative form of the inequality (17).

Lemma 1. *Under the notation of* **Case 1**, *for any symmetric $n\times n$ matrix M, we have*

$$\mathcal{G}_\kappa(M) \geq c\sum_{i=1}^n \min\left\{\mu_i^2, |\mu_i|\right\}, \tag{19}$$

where $\mu_1,\cdots,\mu_n$ are the eigenvalues of $M-I$ and for some numerical constant $c>0$.

Proof. The main point is the following inequality valid for $t \geq -1$,

$$\log(1+t) \leq t - c\min\left\{t^2, |t|\right\},$$

where $c > 0$ is a numerical constant (for instance $c = \frac{3}{10}$ works). Then, applying it with μ_i and after summing, this gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1+\mu_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i - c\sum_{i=1}^{n} \min\left\{|\mu_i|, \mu_i^2\right\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{i=1}^{n} (1+\mu_i)^{-1/\beta} &\geq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\beta}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i + c\frac{1}{\beta}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\min\left\{|\mu_i|, \mu_i^2\right\}\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\beta}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i + c\frac{1}{\beta}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\min\left\{|\mu_i|, \mu_i^2\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^{n}(1+\mu_i)^{-1/\beta} = \det^{-1/\beta}(M)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i = \operatorname{tr}(M-I)$ dividing by $\frac{1}{\beta} > 0$ ends the proof. □

Let us prove now Theorem 2.

Proof. We go back to (18) and we use the previous Lemma to minimize $\int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa\left(D^2\theta(x)\right)\rho_{\beta,W}$:

$$\int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa\left(D^2\theta(x)\right)\rho_{\beta,W} \geq c\int \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathcal{F}\left(D^2\theta(x)\right)\right)W\rho_{\beta,W}$$

Now, we follow the approach of Cordero-Erausquin in [CE].

Lemma 2. *[CE] For any $n \times n$ symmetric matrix M with eigenvalues larger than -1, we have:*

$$\operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{F}(M)) \geq \frac{1}{8}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \mathcal{F}\left(\sqrt{n}\,|Mu|\right)d\sigma(u).$$

This gives

$$\int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa\left(D^2\theta(x)\right)\rho_{\beta,W} \geq c\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\left(\int \mathcal{F}\left(\sqrt{n}\left|D^2\theta(x)\,u\right|\right)W\rho_{\beta,W}\right)d\sigma(u) \quad (20)$$

Since $D^2\theta(x)\,u = \nabla\left(\nabla\theta(x)\cdot u\right)$, and using (7) in (20), we find

$$\int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa\left(D^2\theta(x)\right)\rho_{\beta,W} \geq c\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\int \mathcal{F}\left(h_W(\rho_{\beta,W})\sqrt{n}\,|\nabla\theta\cdot u|\right)\rho_{\beta,W}d\sigma(u) \quad (21)$$

Note that since ρ and $\rho_{\beta,W}$ have the same center of mass, we have

$$\int \nabla\theta\left(x\right)\cdot u\,\rho_{\beta,W}=0.$$

Before going on, let us use the following Fact.

Fact 1. *There exists $c_n>0$, such that for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\left|x\cdot u\right|d\sigma\left(u\right)=c_n\left|x\right|.$$

Moreover, one can prove that there exists two positive numerical constants, say c and C, such that $c\leq c_n\sqrt{n}\leq C$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $N\left(x\right):=\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\left|x\cdot u\right|d\sigma\left(u\right)$ is a norm invariant with rotations, then it is a multiple of the Euclidean norm. It is classical, see [Bor1, Bor2], that $c_n\simeq\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\left|x\cdot u\right|^2d\sigma\left(u\right)}$ (i.e. up to numerical constants). Then, one can prove, using concentration of measures, that

$$\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\left|x\cdot u\right|^2d\sigma\left(u\right)}\simeq\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

□

Using Fubini's theorem, Jensen's inequality ($\mathcal{F}$ is convex) and Fact 1 in (21), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa\left(D^2\theta\left(x\right)\right)\rho_{\beta,W} &\geq c\int\mathcal{F}\left(h_W\left(\rho_{\beta,W}\right)\sqrt{n}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\left|\nabla\theta\left(x\right)\cdot u\right|d\sigma\left(u\right)\right)\rho_{\beta,W}\\ &\geq C\int\mathcal{F}\left(h_W\left(\rho_{\kappa,W}\right)\left|\nabla\theta\left(x\right)\right|\right)\rho_{\beta,W}\\ &= C\int\widetilde{c}\left(x,T\left(x\right)\right)\rho_{\beta,W}\end{aligned}$$

Replacing this inequality in (18) finishes the proof of Theorem 2.

□

3.2 Case 2

As we say at the beginning of this part, the proof of Theorem 3 is very similar as the one for Theorem 2, the only difference is proof of the quantitative form of (17). That is the goal of the following Lemma.

Lemma 3. *Under the notation of* **Case 2**, *for any nonnegative, symmetric $n \times n$ matrix M and for all $\beta \geq n$, we have:*

$$\mathcal{G}_\kappa(M) \geq \frac{3}{64\beta}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)^2 \mathcal{F}\left(\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}\right). \tag{22}$$

Proof. We introduce the probability measure μ defined on $\mathbb{R}$ by $d\mu = \frac{1}{\beta}\delta_1 + \cdots + \frac{1}{\beta}\delta_n + \left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)\delta_{n+1}$, the function ϕ defined on $[-1,+\infty)$ by $\phi(x) = \log(1+x)$ and the function f defined on $\mathbb{R}$ by:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \mu_i \text{ if } x = i \text{ with } i \in \{1,\cdots,n\}, \\ 0 \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

Let us note that $\phi\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\mu\right) = \log\left(1+\frac{1}{\beta}\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i\right)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(f)\, d\mu = \log\left(\prod_{i=1}^n (1+\mu_i)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\right)$. We start with this inequality: for all $s,t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\log(s) \leq \log(t) + \frac{s-t}{t} - \frac{(s-t)^2}{2\max\{s,t\}^2}. \tag{23}$$

In (23), taking $s = 1+f$ and $t = 1+m = 1+\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\mu$, then integrating with respect to the measure μ, it gives:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(f)\, d\mu \leq \phi(m) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(f-m)^2}{\max\{1+m,1+f\}^2} d\mu.$$

Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(m) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(f)\, d\mu &\geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(f-m)^2}{\max\{1+m,1+f\}^2} d\mu \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4\left(1+\mu_{\max}^2\right)}\int_{\mathbb{R}} (f-m)^2\, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Let us compute $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (f-m)^2\, d\mu$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} (f-m)^2 \, d\mu &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\mu \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i^2 - \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i \right)^2 \\
&\underbrace{\geq}_{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz inequality}} \frac{1}{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\beta} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\beta} \right) \|M - I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So, we have:

$$\phi(m) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(f) \, d\mu \geq \frac{1}{4\beta} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\beta} \right) \frac{\|M - I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2}{1 + \mu_{\max}^2} =: z.$$

Taking the exponential, this yields $e^{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(f) d\mu} \leq e^{-z} e^{\phi(m)}$ then $e^{\phi(m)} - e^{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(f) d\mu} \geq (1 - e^{-z}) e^{\phi(m)}$. It is easy to see that $z \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$, so the inequality $1 - e^{-z} \geq \frac{3}{4} z$ holds. Finally, we have established the following inequality:

$$1 + \mathrm{tr}(M - I) - \det(M)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \geq \frac{3}{16\beta} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\beta} \right) \frac{\|M - I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2}{1 + \mu_{\max}^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \mathrm{tr}(M - I) \right).$$

To conclude, we discuss whether $\mu_{\max}$ is bigger than 1 or not.
We assume $\mu_{\max} \leq 1$. In this case, we have:

$$1 + \mathrm{tr}(M - I) - \det(M)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \geq \frac{3}{32\beta} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\beta} \right)^2 \|M - I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2.$$

We assume $\mu_{\max} \geq 1$. First, we work on $1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \mathrm{tr}(M - I)$. This yields the following lines:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta\left(1+\frac{1}{\beta}\mathrm{tr}\left(M-I\right)\right) &= \beta+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i \\
&\geq (\beta-(n-1))+\mu_{\max} \\
&\geq \mu_{\max} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}|\mu_i| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{n}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$1+\mathrm{tr}\left(M-I\right)-\det\left(M\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \geq \frac{3}{16n\beta^2}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}\frac{\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2}{1+\mu_{\max}^2}.$$

We finally conclude thanks to

$$\frac{\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2}{1+\mu_{\max}^2} \geq \frac{n\mu_{\max}^2}{1+\mu_{\max}^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}n$$

and

$$1+\mathrm{tr}\left(M-I\right)-\det\left(M\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \geq \frac{3}{32\beta^2}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}.$$

In the two cases, we have at the same time the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
1+\mathrm{tr}\left(M-I\right)-\det\left(M\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} &\geq \frac{3}{32\beta^2}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)^2\min\left\{\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}},\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}^2\right\} \\
&\geq \frac{3}{32\beta^2}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)^2\mathcal{F}\left(\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by $\beta>0$, this concludes the proof of the Lemma.

□

Let us end the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof. Let us plug (22) in (18), we obtain,

$$\int W\mathcal{G}_\kappa(D^2\theta(x))\rho_{\beta,W} \geq \frac{3}{64\beta}\left(1-\frac{n}{\beta}\right)^2 \int \mathcal{F}\left(\|M-I\|_{\mathrm{HS}}\right) W\rho_{\beta,W}.$$

The rest of the proof is the same as the one for Theorem 2.

□

4 Linearization and dimensional Brascamp-Lieb inequalities

4.1 Dimensional Brascamp-Lieb inequalities

The goal of this part is to recover dimensional Brascamp-Lieb inequalities. For that, we linearize our transport inequality we established in Theorem 1. Let us cite the result we need for that.

Lemma 4. *[CE]*

Let $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ a function such that $c(y,y) = 0$ and $c(x,y) \geq \delta_0 |x-y|^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for some $\delta_0 > 0$. We assume that for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a nonnegative, symmetric matrix $n \times n$, say H_y, such that

$$c(y, y+h) =_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{2} H_y h \cdot h + |h|^2 o(1).$$

Then, if μ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and g is C^1 compactly supported with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g\, d\mu = 0$, we have

$$\liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\mathcal{W}_c(\mu, (1+\epsilon g)\mu) \geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g f\, d\mu\right)^2}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} H_y^{-1}\nabla f \cdot \nabla f d\mu},$$

for any function C^1 compactly supported f.

Using this Lemma to linearize inequality (6) gives

Theorem 5. *With the notation of Theorem 1 and assuming $\int W^{1/\kappa} = 1$, we have the following inequality*

$$-\kappa \int \left(D^2 W\right)^{-1} \nabla f \cdot \nabla f\, \rho_{\kappa,W} \geq \int g^2\, W\, \rho_{\kappa,W}, \tag{24}$$

with $\int g\, \rho_{\kappa,W} = 0$ and $f = gW$.

As we said in Introduction, we can now retrieve dimensional Brascamp-Lieb inequalities. For example, in **Case 1**, (24) becomes

$$\int \left(-D^2 W\right)^{-1} \nabla f \cdot \nabla f \, \rho_{\beta,W} \geq \beta \int g^2 \, W \, \rho_{\beta,W},$$

whereas in **Case 2**

$$\int \left(D^2 W\right)^{-1} \nabla f \cdot \nabla f \, \rho_{\beta,W} \geq \beta \int g^2 \, W \, \rho_{\beta,W}.$$

Proof. Let us remark first that, when $h \to 0$,

$$c\left(y, y+h\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\kappa+1}{-\kappa} D^2 W\left(y\right)\right)\left(h\right) \cdot h + \left|h\right|^2 o\left(1\right). \tag{25}$$

Let us compute, for g verifying $\int g \, \rho_{\kappa,W} = 0$

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} H_{\kappa,W}\left(\left(1+\epsilon g\right) \rho_{\kappa,W} \| \rho_{\kappa,W}\right).$$

Thanks to Theorem 1, it we will have a maximization of

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} W_{c_{\kappa,W}}\left(\rho_{\kappa,W}, \left(1+\epsilon g\right) \rho_{\kappa,W}\right).$$

Using the definition of the entropy, we have

$$H_{\kappa,W}\left(\left(1+\epsilon g\right) \rho_{\kappa,W} \| \rho_{\kappa,W}\right) = \frac{\kappa+1}{2} \epsilon^2 \int g^2 \, \rho_{\kappa,W}^{1+\kappa} + o\left(\epsilon^2\right). \tag{26}$$

Putting together (25) and (26) thanks to the above Lemma gives the following inequality, for all function f C^1 compactly supported

$$\frac{\kappa+1}{2} \int g^2 \, W \rho_{\kappa,W} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\int g \, f \, \rho_{\kappa,W}\right)^2}{\int \left(\frac{\kappa+1}{-\kappa} D^2 W\right)^{-1} \nabla f \cdot \nabla f \, \rho_{\kappa,W}}.$$

Taking $f = gW$ concludes the proof of the Theorem.

□

4.2 Quantitative forms

In this section, we are interested by giving some quantitative forms of the inequalities stated in (8) and (10). The main argument is, once again, Lemma 4: we use it with the costs we introduced in Theorems 2 and 3. We separate our result whether we are in **Case 1** or in **Case 2**.

Theorem 6. *Under the notation of* **Case 1**, *we have the following inequality*

$$\int \left(-D^2 W + \frac{c}{\beta+1} h_W\left(\rho_{\beta,W}\right) I \right)^{-1} \nabla f \cdot \nabla f \, \rho_{\beta,W} \geq \beta \int g^2 \, W \, \rho_{\beta,W},$$

for some numerical constant $c > 0$ *and with* $\int g \, \rho_{\beta,W} = 0$, $\int x g\left(x\right) \rho_{\beta,W}\left(x\right) = 0$ *and* $f = g\, W$.

And

Theorem 7. *Under the notation of* **Case 2**, *we have the following inequality*

$$\int \left(D^2 W + \frac{c}{\beta\left(\beta-1\right)} \left(1 - \frac{n}{\beta}\right)^2 h_W\left(\rho_{\beta,W}\right) I \right)^{-1} \nabla f \cdot \nabla f \, \rho_{\beta,W} \geq \beta \int g^2 \, W \, \rho_{\beta,W},$$

for some numerical constant $c > 0$ *and with* $\int g \, \rho_{\beta,W} =, 0$ $\int x g\left(x\right) \rho_{\beta,W}\left(x\right) = 0$ *and* $f = g\, W$.

The proofs are very similar as the one for Theorem 5. Anyway, let us proof Theorem 6.

Proof. We keep the notation of Theorem 2. As $\int g \, \rho_{\beta,W} = 0$ and $\int x g\left(x\right) \rho_{\beta,W}\left(x\right) = 0$, the measures $\rho_{\beta,W}$ and $\left(1+\epsilon g\right) \rho_{\beta,W}$ are both probability measures with the same center of mass. Thanks to Theorem 2, it is enough to give as estimation of the relative entropy instead of $\mathcal{W}_c\left(\rho_{\beta,W}, \left(1+\epsilon g\right) \rho_{\beta,W}\right)$. Proof of Theorem 5 gives for the relative entropy:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\kappa,W}\left(\left(1+\epsilon g\right) \rho_{\kappa,W} \| \rho_{\kappa,W}\right) &= \frac{\kappa+1}{2} \epsilon^2 \int g^2 \, \rho_{\kappa,W}^{1+\kappa} + o\left(\epsilon^2\right) \\ &= \frac{\beta+1}{2\beta} \epsilon^2 \int g^2 \, \rho_{\kappa,W}^{1+\kappa} + o\left(\epsilon^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the definition of $\mathcal{F}$, one have

$$\lim_{h \to 0} c\left(y, y+h\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(-\left(\beta+1\right) D^2 W\left(y\right) + c h_W\left(\rho_{\beta,W}\right) I \right),$$

for some numerical constant $c > 0$. Using Lemma 4 with $f = g\, W$ permits to conclude the proof.

□

5 Further remarks on weighted Poincaré inequalities

5.1 Generality on weighted Poincaré inequalities

In (7), we introduced $h_W(\mu)$ as the best nonnegative constant such that the inequality

$$\int \mathcal{F}(|\nabla f|) W d\mu \geq \int \mathcal{F}\left(h_W(\mu)\left|f - m_f\right|\right) d\mu$$

holds for every smooth enough $f \in L^1(\mu)$. Nevertheless, we are convinced that the following definition for weighted Poincaré inequality (note that the weight has not the same place):

$$\int \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{1}{h_W(\mu)} W |\nabla f|\right) d\mu \geq \int \mathcal{F}\left(\left|f - m_f\right|\right) d\mu, \tag{27}$$

is more natural. The next Proposition goes in this way.

Proposition 1. *Let μ a probability measure with a support $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\omega : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+$ a function. If we assume that there exists $h(\mu) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega \left|\frac{1}{h(\mu)} \nabla f\right| \omega \, d\mu \geq \int_\Omega \left|f - m_f\right| d\mu \tag{28}$$

for every smooth enough function $f \in L^1(\mu)$ then the following inequality

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{1}{h(\mu)} \omega |\nabla f|\right) d\mu \geq \int_\Omega \mathcal{F}\left(\left|f - m_f\right|\right) d\mu$$

holds.

The proof is identical to the one of Bobkov-Houdré [B-H] (see [CE]). In the next section, we give an example whereinequality (7) is fulfilled.

5.2 Example of weighted Poincaré inequality

Let us recall the result we will use.

Theorem 8. *[Bo-Le3]*

Let $\kappa \in (-\infty, 0]$ and let μ a κ-concave measure defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (i.e. with the notation introduced in Introduction, we are in **Case 2***). Let $m = \exp\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \log(|x|) \, d\mu(x)\right)$ (note that m is finite). Then, for any non-empty Borel sets A and B in $\mathbb{R}^n$ located at distance $\epsilon = \operatorname{dist}(A, B) > 0$*

$$\mu(A)\,\mu(B) \leq \frac{C_\kappa}{2\epsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\backslash(A\cup B)} (m-\kappa|x|)\,d\mu(x) \tag{29}$$

with C_κ depending continuously in κ in the indicated range.

Thanks to (29), let us deduce a weighted Poincaré inequality. Let us take K a non-empty compact set with smooth enough boundary and if set $A = K\backslash S$ and $B = (\mathbb{R}^n\backslash K)\backslash S$ where S is the closure of the $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$-neighborhood of ∂K in (29) and letting $\epsilon \to 0$, we have:

$$\mu(K)(1-\mu(K)) \leq \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\mu_\omega^+(K), \tag{30}$$

where $\omega(x) = m - \kappa|x|$ and $m = \exp\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\log(|x|)\,d\mu(x)\right)$. If we use the coarea formula in (30), we finally have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left|f(x)-m_f\right|d\mu(x) \leq \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|\nabla f(x)|\,\omega(x)\,d\mu(x). \tag{31}$$

Now, we give an example of density ρ_β such that the measure $\rho_\beta(x)\,dx$ $\kappa(n)$-concave which satisfy (7). For this, let for $\beta > n$, $\rho_\beta(x) = \frac{1}{Z_\beta}\left(1+|x|^2\right)^{-\beta} = \frac{1}{Z_\beta}W(x)^{-\beta}$ where $Z_\beta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(1+|x|^2\right)^{-\beta}dx$. Recalling the notation we used in the introduction, we have $\beta = -\frac{1}{\kappa} = \frac{n\kappa(n)-1}{\kappa(n)}$ then $\kappa(n) = \frac{1}{n-\beta}$. Then, the measure $\rho_\beta(x)\,dx$ is κ-concave with $\kappa = \frac{1}{n-\beta}$. If $m = \exp\left(\int\log(|x|)\,\rho_\beta\right)$, using (31), we can write, for all function $f:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ smooth enough (noting C_β instead of C_κ)

$$\begin{aligned}\int\left|f(x)-m_f\right|\rho_\beta &\leq \frac{C_\beta}{2}\int|\nabla f(x)|\left(m+\frac{1}{\beta-n}|x|\right)\rho_\beta\\ &\leq \frac{C_\beta}{2}\max\left\{m,\frac{1}{\beta-n}\right\}\int|\nabla f(x)|\,(1+|x|)\,\rho_\beta.\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 1 gives

$$\int\mathcal{F}\left(\left|f(x)-m_f\right|\right)\rho_\beta \leq \int\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{C_\beta}{2}\max\left\{m,\frac{1}{\beta-n}\right\}|\nabla f|\,(1+|x|)\right)\rho_\beta.$$

Remarking that $\mathcal{F}(ab) \leq \max\left\{a,a^2\right\}\mathcal{F}(b)$ and $(1+|x|)^2 \leq 3\left(1+|x|^2\right)$, this gives

$$\frac{1}{3}\int\mathcal{F}\left(\left|f(x)-m_f\right|\right)\rho_\beta \leq \int\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{C_\beta}{2}\max\left\{m,\frac{1}{\beta-n}\right\}|\nabla f|\right)\left(1+|x|^2\right)\rho_\beta.$$

Since $fort \geq 0$, $\mathcal{F}(t/12) \leq \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{F}(t)$, we have

$$\int \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{1}{12}\left|f(x) - m_f\right|\right)\rho_{\beta,W} \leq \int \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{C_\beta}{2}\max\left\{m, \frac{1}{\beta - n}\right\}|\nabla f|\right) W\rho_\beta,$$

or equivalently

$$\int \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{1}{6C_\beta \max\left\{m, \frac{1}{\beta-n}\right\}}\left|f - m_f\right|\right)\rho_\beta \leq \int \mathcal{F}(|\nabla f|) W\rho_\beta. \tag{32}$$

Thus (32) provides an example where (7) is satisfied with the constant $h_W(\rho_{\beta,W}) = \frac{1}{6C_\beta \max\left\{m, \frac{1}{\beta-n}\right\}} > 0$. To conclude properly, one can give an estimation of m. If we note, for $q \geq 0$

$$m_q = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^q \rho_\beta(x)\, dx\right)^{1/q},$$

then we have the following lines

$$\begin{aligned} m &\leq m_1 \\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|x|}{\left(1+|x|^2\right)^\beta} dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\left(1+|x|^2\right)^\beta} dx} \\ &= \frac{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^n}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr}{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to give an estimation of

$$\frac{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^n}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr}{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr}.$$

If we note

$$I_n(\beta) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^n}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr = \int_0^{+\infty} r^n e^{-\beta \log\left(1+r^2\right)} dr,$$

one can have, thanks to Laplace's method (see [D])

$$I_n(\beta) \underset{\beta \to +\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)\beta^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}$$

and

$$\frac{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^n}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr}{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{r^{n-1}}{(1+r^2)^\beta} dr} \underset{\beta \to +\infty}{\sim} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \sqrt{\beta}.$$

Since $\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \underset{n \to +\infty}{\sim} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}$, we have $m \leq C\sqrt{n\beta}$ for some numerical constant C and for all $\beta \geq n$, this finally gives

$$h_W\left(\rho_{\beta,W}\right) \geq \frac{1}{6C_\beta \max\left\{C\sqrt{n\beta}, \frac{1}{\beta - n}\right\}}.$$

References

[B-H] S. Bobkov, C. Houdré, Some Connections between Sobolev-type Inequalities and Isoperimetry. AMS, 1997.

[Bo-Le1] S.Bobkov, M. Ledoux, From Brunn-Minkowski to Brascamp-Lieb and to logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. Geom. Funct. Anal. 10, pp. 1028-1052 (2000).

[Bo-Le2] S. Bobkov, M. Ledoux, On weighted isoperimetric and Poincaré-type inequalities. IMS Collections. High Dimensional Probability V: The Luminy Volume. Vol. 5, pp. 1-29 (2009).

[Bo-Le3] S. Bobkov, M. Ledoux, Weighted Poincaré-type inequalities for Cauchy and other convex measures. Ann. Probability 37, pp. 403-427 (2009).

[Bor1] C. Borell, Convex measures on locally convex spaces. Ark. Mat. 12, pp. 239-253 (1974).

[Bor2] C. Borell, Convex set functions in d-space. Period. Math. Hungar. 6, pp. 111-136 (1975).

[Br-Li] H.J. Brascamp, E. Lieb, On Extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler Theorems, Including Inequalities for Log Concave Functions and with an Application to the Diffusion Equation. J. Funct. Anal. 22, pp. 366-389 (1976).

[B-G-Va-Vr] S. Brazitikos, A. Giannopoulos, P. Valettas, B.-H. Vritsiou, Geometry of isotropic convex bodies. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 196. AMS, Providence, RI (2014).

[Br] Y. Brenier, Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 44, no.4, pp. 375-417 (1991).

[Ca1] L.A. Caffarelli, Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials. II. Ann. of Math. (2) 144, no. 3, pp. 453-496 (1996).

[Ca2] L. Caffarelli, The regularity of mappings with a convex potential. J. Amer. Math. Soc.(1), pp. 99-104 (1996).

[CE] D. Cordero-Erausquin, Transport inequalities for log-concave measures, quantitative forms and applications. ArXiv version (2016).

[CE-G-H] D. Cordero-Erausquin, W. Gangbo, C. Houdré, Inequalities for generalized entropy and optimal transportation. Recent Advances in the Theory and Applications of Mass Transport, Contemp. Math. 353, A.M.S., Providence, R.I. (2004).

[CE-Na-V] D. Cordero-Erausquin, B. Nazaret, C. Villani, A mass transportation approach to sharp Sobolev and Gagliardo-Niremberg inequalities. Advances in Math. 182, pp. 307-332 (2004).

[El] R. Eldan, Thin shell implies spectral gap up to polylog via a stochastic localization scheme. Geometric and Functional Analysis. April 2013, Volume 23, Issue 2, pp 532-569 (2013).

[D] J. Dieudonné, Calcul infinitésimal. Hermann, Paris (1997).

[F-Ma-P] A. Figalli, F. Maggi, A. Pratelli, A refined Brunn-Minkowski inequality for convex sets. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaires 26, pp. 2511-2519 (2009).

[G-Mi] O. Guédon, E. Milman, Interpolating thin-shell and sharp large-deviation estimates for isotropic log-concave measures. Geometric And Functional Analysis 21, no. 5, pp. 1043-1068 (2011).

[K-Lo-Si] R. Kannan, L. Lovasz, M. Simonovits, Isoperimetric Problems for Convex Bodies and a Localization Lemma. Discrete Comput. Geom., 13, no. 3-4, pp. 541-559 (1995).

[Kl] B. Klartag, Concentration of measures supported on the cube. Israel J. of Math. 203, pp. 59-80 (2014).

[Mc1] R.J. McCann, Existence and uniqueness of monotone measure-preserving maps. Duke Math. J., Vol. 80, pp. 309-323 (1995).

[Mc2] R.J. McCann, A convex principle for interacting gases. Adv. Math., Vol. 128, pp. 153-179 (1997).

[Mi1] E. Milman, On the role of Convexity in Isoperimetric, Spectral Gap and Concentration. Invent. Math. 177, no. 1, pp. 1-43 (2009).

[Mi2] E. Milman, Beyond traditional Curvature-Dimension I: new model spaces for isoperimetric and concentration inequalities in negative dimension. To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (2015).

[Ng] V.H. Nguyen, Dimensional variance inequalities of Brascam-Lieb type and a local approach to dimensional Prekopa's theorem. J. Funct. Anal. 266, pp. 931-955 (2014).

[R] R. T. Rockafellar, Convex Analysis. Princeton Mathematical Series, no. 28, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (1970).

[Se] A. Segal, Remark on Stability of Brunn-Minkowski and Isoperimetric Inequalities for Convex Bodies. Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis Volume 2050 of the series Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pp. 381-391 (2012).

[V] C. Villani, Optimal Transportation. Old and new. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2009).

Erik Thomas
Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu,
Université Pierre et Marie Curie - Paris 6,
75252 Paris Cedex 05, France.
erik.thomas@imj-prg.fr